Frederick Ward Associates, Inc. Community Input Meeting

Laurel Bush Estates

Project No. 2051152.01

DATE:

August 01, 2010

TIME:

6:00 pm

LOCATION:

Abingdon Volunteer Fire Department

3306 Abingdon Road

Abingdon, Maryland, 21009

PRESENT:

See Sign-in Sheet Attached

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the meeting is to present the Concept Plan for a 130 lot single family subdivision consisting of three parcels of land zoned R1 and AG to the Community and answer any questions

the public may have regarding this development.

PROCEEDINGS:

The meeting was opened at approximately 6:10 PM by Kevin Small of Frederick Ward Associates (FWA) where he provided a brief introduction and description of the CIM and development process and description of the subject site plan.

The Project summary included the following:

- Site Location and surrounding development
- Introduction Owner and Developer
- History of the Project
- A PowerPoint presentation was made for the proposed development and discussion that followed.

DISCUSSION

A question was asked if purchase of the land was complete.

The land was under contract and would be finalized upon recording of the final plats.

Questions were asked about what was the purchase price?

The development team answered they did not know.

Various questions we raised about traffic and concern about 130 new homes with 2 cars per home and that this additional traffic would make the existing traffic more unbearable particularly at the intersection of Hookers Mill Road and Laurel Bush Road.

Mr. Small responded that the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was not complete at this time and went on to explain what intersections were to be studied at the direction of Harford County as well as what responsibilities the developer would have to mitigate the impact.

A citizen that lived along Laurel Bush Road expressed his concern that there were not enough existing rights of way along Laurel Bush Road to make improvements without acquiring additional land.

Mr. Small explained that the developer would be required to dedicate a 30 feet wide Public Road right of way along the project frontage and make improvements such as acceleration and deceleration lanes along with the necessary pavement widening.

A citizen asked if the traffic impacts that this development would generate if the impact from other people that live near this development and other developments was taken into consideration or just the impacts as a result of this development.

Mr. Small explained the Adequate Public Facilities legislation that described the "Levels of Service (LOS)" and any if there are any impacts as a result of this development that resulted in the intersection failing, the developer would have to make improvements that mitigate this impact to the condition the intersection was before the development occurred.

A citizen asked a question about the availability of public water and sewer and school capacity.

Mr. Small responded that an adequate public facilities check was part of the development process and the county would identify any sewer system downstream that would need to be addressed. A check of the school attendance area indicated that no schools would be over capacity in the near future.

A question was asked about the construction time for this project.

Mr. Small stated that it would take 3 to 4 years to build out but everything was tied to the state of the economy.

When would construction Begin?

Mr. Small answered 'next spring'.

A citizen asked is there a possibility that the final number of lots could be reduced?

Mr. Small responded 'yes' once we get into a more detailed study of various development requirements such as open space, SWM, reforestation, etc..

A citizen who lives off Hookers Mill Road and their property abutted this property asked if the 35 ft open space strip between their lot and the new lots could be widened.

Mr. Small responded that due to the constraints at this particular area of the project, this would be difficult. However, FWA would look into moving the road. The 35 feet would become an area of reforestation and a berm would be constructed to help buffer the two developments.

A citizen asked if we could not put so many homes in this area.

Mr. Small responded that the recent rezoning allowed many more homes and the project was only utilizing two-thirds of the total density allowed.

A comment was presented by a citizen about the option not to build anything at all.

Mr. Small responded that the property was properly zoned for this type of development and that we were not developing this project to the maximum density.

A question was asked about the existing farm ponds and what would happen to them.

Mr. Schaffer responded that the ponds would be removed due to safety reasons and that the ponds probably were not built to current small pond specifications.

A citizen asked if we could move the proposed trail away from 734 Hookers Mill Road and that she has had enough problems with people trespassing onto her property.

Mr. Small responded that trail could be moved.

The same citizen asked why we put the active open space where we have shown it and not adjacent to her property.

Mr. Small explained that the place where the active open space was located was better suited for the overall development since this area is located where the soils could not support lots

A question was asked about the size of the proposed homes and the expected price?

Mr. Small explained that the houses would be around 2400 s.f. and the asking price was yet to be determined.

A question was asked if the project would be phased.

Mr. Small responded that yes it would be phased but the exact area was yet to be determined.

A question asked where would the project start?

Mr. Schaffer responded the first phase would begin along Laurel Bush Road and the proposed new road including the 5 lots accessing onto Laurel Bush Road.

Has a builder been selected?

Mr. Small responded 'no'.

A citizen asked what would happen to the current access easement the subject property owner uses to access Hookers Mill Road.

Mr. Rudisill responded that that access easement was a 'handshake' agreement and no formal easement exists. This easement /access will not be retained by the developer.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

This report represents the Planner's Summation of the proceedings and is not a transcript although an attempt was made to document/summarize what was said in dialogue fashion.

Submitted by:

Frederick Ward Associates, Inc.

Lou Schaffer Project Planner/Senior Project Designer